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Department/Program starts program review according to rotation cycle—September 1
Note: Timelines may be adjusted to accommodate the budget timeline

Step 1. Initial report is drafted—February 1
• Department/program chair, designee, or committee drafts the initial report based on guidelines
• Assessment coordinator of college or unit provides guidance, input and support
• IR provides data packet and templates, and other data support as needed
• Dean or unit head provides input as appropriate, and provides resources as needed
• **Timeline: Five months**—starts September 1, and initial draft is ready by **February 1** including tentative action recommendations

Step 2. External review is conducted before the final draft—March 1
• Extern reviewer(s) is recruited with input from the assessment coordinator while the report is being drafted
• Dean’s office or unit head approves the external reviewer(s)
• External reviewer(s) reads the initial draft, and visits the campus during the first part of the month of March
• External reviewer(s) provides feedback in a report following the guideline, and makes recommendations regarding the content of the initial report, and makes further recommendations for action and/or affirms the initial action recommendations
• Office of Institutional Research and Assessment funds the external review
• **Timeline: One month**—external reviewer report is received by **March 1**

Step 3. Final report is prepared—May 1
• Final report incorporates feedback and recommendations of external reviewer(s)
• Final report may includes action recommendations for program improvement that are **resource intensive** as well as ones that do **not involve direct cost**
• Assessment coordinator provides support and feedback to the writing of the final report
• External reviewer(s) report becomes an appendix in the report
• **Timeline: Two months**—Final report with revisions based on the external review is prepared by **May 1**

Step 4. Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC) reviews the final program review report—July 1
• With the approval of the dean or the unit head, the assessment coordinator submits the report to the EEC
• EEC evaluates the final program review report using a rubric based on the guidelines, and takes one of two possible actions:
a. **Validates** the quality of the report; provides written statement to that effect to the assessment coordinator, who then sends the report to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment for posting

b. **Accepts the report but determines the report could be improved;** provides written feedback to the assessment coordinator to that effect with the expectation that the next report would incorporate the feedback for improvement; if appropriate and feasible, assessment coordinator makes adjustments to the report and sends the report to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment for posting

- **Timeline: Two months**—EEC provides response by **July 1**

**Step 5. Dean or unit head receives and responds to the program review—August 1**
- At the same time that the EEC receives the program review report the dean or unit head receives the report from the assessment coordinator
  - Dean or unit head **writes a responds** addressing the action recommendations
  - The **written response** includes in some priority order how the dean or the unit head would support the action recommendations
  - Dean consults with the department chair and provost while writing the response
  - The written response is addressed to the provost and the department chair
  - **Time line: One month**—Dean or unit head writes MOU by **August 1**

**Step 6. Provost receives the written response from deans or unit heads and responds—September 1**
- Provost reviews the written response and responds one of two ways:
  a. **Validates** the written response and sends an acknowledgement to the dean or the unit head, with a CC to the department or program chair
  b. **Determines the written response need modification** and sends it back to the dean or unit head for revision
- Provost secures funding for recommendations that need resources as appropriate in consultation with the President’s Executive Committee (PEC)
- **Time line: One month**—Provost responds by **September 1**

**Step 7. Loop Closing: Yearly action updates are provided by department/program chairs or unit heads—September of each year**
- Department or program develops action plans to implement the action recommendations over multiple years as appropriate
- Yearly updates document the actions that have been taken to improve the department or the program
- The assessment coordinator submits the yearly updates to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment for posting
- Deans and unit heads use yearly action updates to consult with the provost regarding resource allocations
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